

## **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-27 remain in this application.

### **Objections to the application**

Claims 1, 7, 8, 15 and 21 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to address the informalities.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-7 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Delia et al (US 2003/0115273 A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to determine at a sender location if the received message is from the sender location. Delia does not describe this feature. In order to sustain a novelty rejection each element of the claim has to be described by the cited reference. In this invention, the step of determining an origin of the attachment to the electronic message, by determining whether the attachment was created at the location of the sender of the electronic message, is not therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 8-14 and 21-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over various combinations of Delia (U.S. Publication 20030115273 in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent application publication 20020034688). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner states that Delia does not expressly disclose the claimed feature of determining whether the electronic mail recipient desires to modify an attachment that originated at the destination location of the electronic message. Examiner further asserts that Dunn discloses when user desires to modify..., the attachment, links to the attachment are provided with an email message. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Dunn does not inquire whether a user desires to modify an attachment. In Dunn, the method responds to a modification of the attachment but there is no initial query of the user as described and claimed in the present invention. Therefore, Applicants submit that

the step of determining whether the user desires to modify an attachment is not taught or suggested in Dunn.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Darcell Walker  
Reg. No. 34,945  
P. O. Box 25048  
Houston, Texas 77265  
713-772-1255  
June 9, 2008